

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 5, 2006. Claims 42 to 45, 47, 59, and 76 to 82 are pending in the application, of which Claims 42, 59 and 78 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 42 to 44, 47, 59 and 76 to 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,088,120 (Shibusawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,103 (Zuber). Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shibusawa in view of Zuber and well-known prior art, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194 (Lobiondo). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns generating a synthesized capability description file in which capability description files of plural devices are combined or synthesized. More specifically, the invention concerns enabling generation of an appropriate synthesized capability description file according to a format of a value of a capability described in the capability description file when a method of generating the synthesized capability description file is different according to the kind of the capability description file. In other words, if the value of the capability described in the capability description information is of a first format, it is preferable to generate the synthesizing description file by executing arithmetic calculation of the value of the capability of a first print apparatus and a value of the capability of a second print apparatus. However, if the value of the capability described in the capability description information is of a second format, it is preferable to generate synthesized capability description file by executing Boolean operation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of

the capability of the second print apparatus. In this connection, the present invention provides a step of, or unit for, judging whether the value of the capability described in the received capability description information is the first format or the second format, and, based on the judged result, generating the synthesized capability description file by the arithmetic calculation or the Boolean operation.

Therefore, in accordance to the present invention, even if two kinds of capability description files may be received, it is possible to properly generate the synthesized capability description file according to kind of file received.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 42 is directed to a print processing method which is executed by a print system to which plural print apparatuses and an information processing apparatus are connected. The method includes a selecting step of selecting at least two or more print apparatuses from among the plural print apparatuses; a receiving step of receiving capability description information of a first print apparatus and capability description information of a second print apparatus, both selected in the selecting step; a generating step of generating synthesized capability description information obtained by synthesizing the capability description information of the first print apparatus and the capability description information of the second print apparatus; and a judging step of judging whether a value of the capability described in the capability description information received in the receiving step is a first format or a second format. As a result of the judgment in the judging step, in a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the first format, the generating step determines the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing arithmetic calculation of the value of the

capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus. In a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the second format, the generating step determines the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing Boolean operation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shibusawa and Zuber do not disclose or suggest, either alone or in combination, at least the features of judging whether a value of the capability described in the capability description information received in said receiving step is a first format or a second format, wherein, as a result of the judgment, in a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the first format, determining the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing arithmetic calculation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus, and wherein, in a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the second format, determining the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing Boolean operation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus.

More specifically, Shibusawa discloses that, in a case where a printer having the capability of printing on A4, B4 and A3 sheets and another printer having the capability of printing on A5 and A4 sheets are synthesized, the synthesized printer corresponds to A5, A4, B4 and A3 sheets. That is, Shibusawa discloses that a synthesized

printer's capabilities include a union of the sets of capabilities of constituent printers.

However, nothing in Shibusawa discloses or suggests generating a synthesizing description file by executing arithmetic calculation of the value of the capability of a first print apparatus and the value of the capability of a second print apparatus.

Moreover, as Zuber merely discloses summing engine speeds, a proper combination of Shibusawa and Zuber merely suggests that two kinds of operation methods might be possible without disclosing or suggesting any sort of mechanism for managing the two kinds of operation methods. Specifically, neither Shibusawa nor Zuber disclose or suggest, that when there are two possible operation methods, judging whether a value of a capability described in capability description information is a first format or a second format. Furthermore, as neither Shibusawa nor Zuber contemplated this possibility or the desirability of a judging capabilities, neither Shibusawa nor Zuber, neither alone nor in combination, disclose or suggest that, as a result of the judgment, in a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the first format, determining the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing arithmetic calculation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus, and wherein, in a case where the value of the capability described in the capability description information is the second format, determining the value of the capability described in the synthesized capability description information by executing Boolean operation of the value of the capability of the first print apparatus and the value of the capability of the second print apparatus.

Applicant has reviewed Lobiondo and found nothing in Lobiondo that cures the above-described deficiencies of Shibusawa and Zuber. In light of these deficiencies in Shibusawa, Zuber and Lobiondo, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 42 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 59 and 78 are directed to a program stored on a computer-readable storage medium, and an information processing apparatus, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 42. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 59 and 78 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. However, as each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 124282v1